```
1
    COUNTRYMAN & McDANIEL
    MICHAEL S. McDANIEL [State Bar No. 66774]
 2
    cargolaw@aol.com
    GEOFFREY W. GILL
                       [State Bar No. 163621]
    qwq@carqolaw.com
 3
    LAX Airport Center, Eleventh Floor
    5933 West Century Boulevard
    Los Angeles, California 90045
 5
    Telephone: (310) 342-6500
    Facsimile: (310) 342-6505
 6
    Attorneys for defendant
 7
   HAAS INDUSTRIES, INC.
 8
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
             NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SAN FRANCISCO
10
11
   ONE BEACON INSURANCE COMPANY, ) CASE NO. 3:07-CV-03540-BZ
   a corporation,
12
                                    OBJECTION BY HAAS INDUSTRIES.
              Plaintiff,
                                    INC. TO SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
13
                                    UNDISPUTED FACTS
        vs.
14
                                    Date:
                                                 April 2, 2008
   HAAS INDUSTRIES, INC., a
                                    Time:
                                                 10:00 a.m.
15
   corporation,
                                    Courtroom: Courtroom G
16
              Defendants.
17
18
        Defendant HAAS Industries, Inc. respectfully objects to the
```

Defendant HAAS Industries, Inc. respectfully objects to the Separate Statement of Undisputed Facts in that neither Undisputed Fact is relevant to the issues raised by plaintiff's Motion. Fed. R. Evid. 402 provides in relevant part that: "Evidence which is not relevant is not admissible."

23

24

25

26

27

28

19

20

21

22

Defendant presumes that plaintiff will argue from the FOB nature of the shipment that the accord and satisfaction with Omneon Video Networks ("Omneon") was with a party lacking standing to settle the claim. However, as is clear from the declaration of Carmen Holster, Defendant's Comptroller, Omneon in every way

- 1 -

Case 3:07-cv-03540-BZ Document 27 Filed 03/12/2008 Page 2 of 2 possible presented itself as the proper claimant. Whether the shipment was or was not FOB is therefore not relevant.

As is clear from the discussion at Point IV of Defendant's Opposition, the distinction between contract and common carriers is not relevant to the pending issue, which has nothing to do with whether cargo liability insurance is necessary on the part of the carrier.

Dated: March $\prime \nu$, 2008

COUNTRYMAN & McDANIEL MICHAEL S. McDANIEL GEOFFREY W. GILL

By:

GEOFFREY W. GILI

Attorneys for defendant HAAS INDUSTRIES, INC.

<u> 2 -</u>